



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

disguise would not have so boldly stalked across the country under a party banner as in 1896.

Let us take also a Continental illustration. The public debt of France is more than \$6,000,000,000. The funded debt, represented in the French rentes, is largely owned by individual citizens of France. At the end of the Franco-Prussian War the French Government was forced to pay an indemnity of \$1,000,000,000. One hundred million dollars in three per cent. rentes were offered to the people and twice the amount subscribed in a single day. Later \$150,000,000 of three per cent. rentes were offered, and a subscription of twelve-fold the amount was the immediate result. What a splendid tribute to the patriotism of France! The French rentes, like the British consol, is an important collateral asset in the business of the Republic. In fact, but for the bond system of the world, represented in negotiable securities, the claim of the Populist—that there is too little money—might find substantiation.

Economically viewed, we incline strongly to the opinion that it would prove a wise policy, not only to meet the expenses of the Spanish War by a popular loan, but also to convert the entire national debt at future renewals into a low rate bond of small denomination, and offered in installments from time to time as the citizens would invest. We venture to say that it would not be long before the wage-earners and the farmers would prefer an interest bearing bond—which works while they sleep—to idle bank accounts, and they would soon learn commercially that the bond was an asset which possessed many of the advantages of a circulating medium. And then, politically, what a bulwark it would prove to the public credit! Lombard Street and Wall Street would no longer be hobgoblins even to the Populists; the public faith would no longer be assailed by careless talk of scaling the obligations of the Government, or by threats of repudiation and liquidation in a fifty cent dollar.

We would esteem the Spanish War a reasonably cheap investment, if it will only introduce to our people the economic advantages of Popular Bonds (*i.e.*, bonds in small denominations in which all our citizens can invest), and if it will hasten the day when the American interest-bearing debt, under future renewals, is taken from syndicates and placed in the pockets of wage-earners of the United States. This will be accomplished when the bond in small denominations, from time to time, is offered to our people as an investment, and when that time comes it will be the knell of fiat money and the surest guarantee of the public credit.

S. D. McCORMICK.

---

## THE EFFICACY OF PRAYER IN THE LIGHT OF EVOLUTION.

INTELLIGENT men of to-day will probably agree that the fundamental question of religion and the vital issue between science and theology is the Efficacy of Prayer. Now, what exactly do we mean by the Efficacy of Prayer? Upon what accepted idea or fact does our belief in the Efficacy of Prayer depend?

It is evident that the consideration of these two questions does not involve the Biblical warrant or the religious duty of prayer. These can hardly be considered open questions. That which is more germane to the thought of the day, is a rational philosophy of things which justifies prayer. We have fallen upon an age which delights in what it calls "the scientific method." Scientific facts and points of view are slowly but surely modifying our

theological interpretations. With all the apprehensions that obtain in certain quarters, we believe that science or criticism or any form of demonstrated fact can do nothing to theology—to the genuine theology of the Bible and the Church—except to vindicate it, clarify it and enrich it. A fact wherever found is a divine thing. All that we have to do is to recognize it, define its relations and, as far as we can, determine its place in the universal system. Is there any place in that system for a rational belief in the Efficacy of Prayer?

But, first, what do we mean by the Efficacy of Prayer? Let us fall into no confusion or illusion touching this matter. Do we mean simply the subjective or reflex value of prayer? I concede that this is no mean value. Unquestionably, it is one of God's methods in the answering of our prayers. If the subjective effect upon him who prays were all that could be accomplished through his prayer, this alone would justify prayer. And in claiming for prayer this measure of efficacy, we occupy this tremendous coign of vantage; we do not go beyond the domain of observed and certified fact. We keep our feet on scientific ground. Prayer, in short, becomes a scientific duty. The man who refuses to pray fervently and believingly is not simply irreligious, he is unscientific.

This strange but real aspect of the matter is the result of the recent expansions of science. It dislikes the word "Metaphysics," but it finds that it cannot exhaust or explain nature by its crucibles and scalpels. There is an elusive remainder which it must take into account. Physiology, in explaining one-fourth of man, has left three-fourths to be explained by psychology. In fact, science is just beginning its serious work: This work lies in the mysterious borderland between mind and matter. Whatever our theories of mind and matter, the borderland is as real as a geographical frontier or a sea-coast. The difficulty is that this borderland is a fathomless abyss in which mind and matter interact across inappreciable distances. There our science is confronted with facts which it has only recently recognized and has not yet fully classified. The facts are the most intimate, significant, subtle, deep-rooted facts in our being. Our science is groping and fumbling among the facts; but for the most part this broad frontier-belt, where the forces of mind and body interplay, is marked in our scientific charts as "unexplored territory." Our explorations, as far as they have gone, bring out this point more and more clearly. The mind works on the body. The mental condition modifies the nervous and chemic interactions. We are lifted into unknown energies and heroisms by stimulants and reinforcements to our will. This is the grain of truth in "Faith Cures" and kindred combinations of fact and delusion. The subjective function of prayer, however, is not a delusion. Our beliefs and imaginations and desires are positive forces, and they are reinforced by infinite multiples by leaning on an Omnipotent Arm. God's answers to our prayers are no less real because they come to us on the lines of the forces by which He has made us what we are.

But the question remains, and this, we all agree, is the crucial question: Do our prayers work other than reflex result? Do they blend with and affect the play of physical law outside of ourselves? Shall a man pray for success in business? Shall a soldier pray amid the thundering guns of battle? Shall a mother pray for her sick child? She will pray at any rate. No theories can stifle her prayer. The soul in its love and agony cries to God as instinctively as the root underground thrusts its heart up to the sunlight. This is the stem on which all the religions of the world have flung out their flower

and fruitage. The human heart, in the exigencies of life, with its changeless needs and sharpened hungers, has given hostages to the permanence of religion amid all the marches of the world's knowledge and the shifting fronts of the world's thought. Our needs and desires league themselves with the heavens. The deep within cries to the deep without. But can we hope for answer, an answer that shall slide into our lives along grooves of law and by thrust of forces which lie beyond ourselves?

This is what we mean by the Efficacy of Prayer. Now, is there any rational interpretation of the universe which makes this possible and probable? Any interpretation of the universe, of course, involves the question of God. It must either deny God or assert His being and relationships. I feel quite sure of my ground, when I say that the trend of recent scientific thought is toward a conception of the universe which furnishes new suggestions and arguments for the justification of prayer. On the other hand, I think that I am fair when I say that the science of a hundred years ago had a conception of the universe, and the religion of a hundred years ago had a conception of God, which made the Christian doctrine of prayer impossible. The religion of the day in the long run always locks hands with the science of the day. This is true of the Deism of the eighteenth century, against which the great Bishop Butler fought, and which treated the universe as a watch manufactured and wound up by God. The cosmic watch was Paley's great proof of divine intelligence and purpose in nature.

This watch is still found in some belated treatises on theology. The Deism which it represented was simply the religious side of the materialism which dominated the science of the period. The world was figured as a machine. Of course, God was figured as a machinist, who, having fashioned the wheels, sat on high and watched them revolve according to the structural laws of the machine.

But materialism is now a cast-off garment in the world's intellectual wardrobe. The science of the day has discovered that it utterly fails to cover the facts of life. Its theological analogue, Deism, has shared the same fate. It was a shallow theology which materialized the spiritual life, and was a degeneration from the theology of the great fathers and geniuses of the fourth century, like Athanasius, who argued against the pagans that God was a creator, not a carpenter. The pendulum has swung toward a new science and the older theology.

We no longer conceive the universe as a machine, but as an organism. It is a living thing. There is within it a force which makes it unfold, as a flower unfolds. Our modern science, in its doctrine of Evolution, tells us this much. Even where the mechanical conception of the universe lingers in its phraseology, our science has caught, as in the vision of the old Hebrew prophet, some glimpse of "the spirit of the living creature in the wheels." This all-pervasive, creative force in nature we call God. Science asserts His being, although it does not pronounce His name. He is immanent in nature and yet He transcends nature. The idea of His transcendence, as well as the idea of His immanence, is scientifically legitimate and necessary.

We find in ourselves something that we call "personality." This is the bottommost fact in our being and it is the highest reach of life that we know. We are part of the universe and we cannot leave out ourselves in searching for its key. God cannot be less than ourselves. We must read His nature from our own nature. He is all that we are and infinitely more. He is the cosmic force, and besides this, He is the summit and the fountain

of the sentimental, intellectual and moral energy, of which we find in ourselves broken gleams and potencies.

We discover this conception of God in the Psalmists and Prophets of the Old Testament. It comes out in the progressive revelations by slowly uplifted veils. But we must go to Christ for the full delineation of the idea. What was the great word that was always on His lips, that He made the invocation of His world-prayer? "Our father who art in Heaven." As we look closely into nature, we find there a force as strong as the force of gravitation. This force is the love in the heart of fatherhood and motherhood. It knits the web of life, as the force of gravitation knits the web of matter. It is found in the lowest as well as the highest ranges of life. This force Christ put on the throne of the heavens. Nay, that does not express it! This sweetest, tenderest, strongest force that we know, Christ put in the height and depth and inmost recess and minutest process of nature. Christ shows us a Father's heart in the bosom of things, and the throbbings of that heart are the origin and motion and life and evolutionary thrust and upward climbing force of the universe.

The Fatherhood of God—this is the root of the religion of Christ. The way in which He pressed it and reiterated it shows that He held it to be the root. All the facts in His religion cluster around, or rather are born of, this fact. All the doctrines must be interpreted by this doctrine. It is the measuring-rod of all Christian theology. And it is the justification of our belief in the Efficacy of Prayer. Christ has taught us, once for all, the logic of prayer. Here it is: "If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in Heaven give good things to them that ask Him." It is a philosophy which we can all understand. Prayer is the heart of a child throbbing against the heart of a father. We can measure the instincts and laws of the divine Fatherhood by the instincts and laws of our human fatherhood.

Against all this there is only one argument—the reign of law, its universality and inflexibility. But this argument no more prevails against the efficacy of prayer than it prevails against the freedom of the will and our moral responsibility. Our will, moment by moment, utilizes the laws of nature. Shall not the Divine Will make the laws of nature its ministers? We cannot measure the possibilities that lie within the lines of God's laws. His great, pitiful Fatherhood throbs behind those laws, and somehow along their grooves He can send us the answer to our prayers. No need can come to us too small for His care, too great for His omnipotence. He is well pleased that we should lay hold of His divine arm with importunate cries. But our cries must be upborne and sanctified by that prayer of Christ in the shadows of Gethsemane, that prayer oft-times wrung from such recoils of soul: "Thy will be done." This is the limitation of every prayer that is inspired by His spirit and winged with His name. We know not how God will accomplish His will, but we do know that our prayers lodge in His bosom, and, lodging there, become a force in the sum of things, and are blended with the forces that outflow from His bosom and make the conditions and events of our life.

WALTON W. BATTERSHALL.

---

#### ABOUT BOYS AND BOYS' CLUBS.

THE poor boys of large cities have three salient defects which render work among them highly perplexing and difficult.